



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/727,322	12/03/2003	Victor S. Chan	CA920030029US1	6214
50170 7590 01/09/2008 IBM CORP. (WIP) c/o WALDER INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW, P.C. P.O. BOX 832745 RICHARDSON, TX 75083			EXAMINER ABEDIN, SHANTO	
			ART UNIT 2136	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 01/09/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

10/727,322

Applicant(s)

CHAN ET AL.

Examiner

Shanto M Z Abedin

Art Unit

2136

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 18 December 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: 1-4, 6-13, 15-22 and 24-27.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____.
13. ☐ Other: _____.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Regarding previous 35 USC 103 (a) type rejections of claims 1-4,6-13,15-22 and 24-27, the applicant primarily argues that the combination of the cited references fails to disclose selecting a session from a plurality of sessions persisted for the user based on the determined security domain. In response to the above arguments, the examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant since upon further consideration, combination of the cited prior art are found to disclose the above limitations.

In particular, Wood et al discloses determining a security domain of the plurality of security domains to which the operation relates (Fig 4.410: domainId; Col 13, lines 1-20; Col 15, starting at line 9; Col 16, starting at line 35; session credentials/ tokens for persistent/ subsequent sessions; accessing resources in several/ multi level domains) .


Furthermore, Low et al discloses selecting a session from a plurality of sessions persisted for the user (Col 2, line 6 -42; Col 13, line 15-67; Claims 1-13; user selecting a session to join from plurality of sessions), and

Furthermore, Hinton et al discloses selecting a session persisted for the user based on the determined security domain (Col 5, line 1 - Col 8, line 67; Claims 1-9; user selecting one of multiple sessions related to multiple security domain; vouching affiliated domain identity for session authentication). Hinton et al further discloses determining a security domain of the plurality of security domains to which the operation relates (Col 17, line 10 to Col 19, line 30; using user identity and/ or role, and domain ID) and the selected session being associated with a user identity and a role, the user identity and role together indicating privileges for invoking operations of the e-commerce site in at least the determined security domain (Col 17, line 10 to Col 19, line 30).

Hinton et al , Low et al and Wood et al are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of session management. At the time of invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Hinton et al or Low et al with Wood et al to design a method further comprising the step of selecting a session from a plurality of sessions persisted for the user based on the determined security domain in order to provide user with multiple session access.

Therefore, the combination of the cited references does teach selecting a session from a plurality of session persisted fro the user based on the detrmined security domain, and the previous 35 USC 103 (a) type rejections are maintained.

NASSER MOAZZAMI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER?
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100


11,7108